

# Pacific Commercial Advertiser Supplement, March 18, 1876

## CIRCULAR.

To the Hon. Godfrey Rhodes, the Hon. A. S. Cleghorn, Walter Murray Gibson, Esq., and to the other gentlemen who signed the Address to His Majesty, dated February 22d, 1876:

GENTLEMEN.—Although His Majesty's Ministers have already replied to the Address to His Majesty, which you presented to him on the 29th ultimo, and which reply they considered due to you, and have there met, as they believe, the main points referring to the subject of repopulation, there are still other important aspects of your Address which the situation demands should be clearly understood both by you, Gentlemen, and the public, and I hope that what I have now to say with reference to it, may not be considered by you either uncalled for, or altogether unprofitable.

It must be now evident to all of you, although no clear and unmistakable language to this effect may be found in it, that the general tenor of your Address as it reads, not Gentlemen, as perhaps you all intended, is to impress upon His Majesty, that there are very important national ends and objects which His Ministers were expected to accomplish, and in which they have failed, and that great danger to the prosperity and independence of this country, has arisen in consequence of this failure, and that therefore His Majesty would do well to call to his aid those who might be more successful in future. This, Gentlemen, is a legitimate object, and one which your duty to your Sovereign and to your country may often call upon you to endeavor to accomplish. Neither would it be always necessary in order to give effect to your wishes, although perhaps desirable, to be either precise or correct in your reasons for recommending such a change, for it might well be the case, that your object was not to inaugurate interminable discussions about measures and policies, but to have placed at the head of affairs, men who would be more successful in effecting what you require, than in explaining why they have not done so. This is virtually what your Address conveys, and whatever views many of you really had on this point, a public document of this character and gravity must be held to mean just whatever may be fairly gathered from its contents.

I address you in my own name now, because, as you are well aware, one of my colleagues has only just arrived in the country, another has only recently joined us, whilst the third was not called to office till a comparatively late day, and they cannot justly be held responsible for the failure to accomplish objects which if accomplished at all, must have been mainly brought about through agencies, instituted before they joined the Cabinet.

Your Address, Gentlemen, calls His Majesty's attention to two great points, namely, the importance of staying the decline of the native race, and the importance of acquiring new people from abroad. As the measures which have to be adopted for each of these ends are clearly distinct, it is well to keep them so in our minds. For, when considering what measures we shall adopt, it merely tends to confuse the question and to mislead us, to assume that the importation of Asiatic races will assist in repopulating the Hawaiian race, or, to speak more correctly, will produce a mixed race which shall have more vitality than the Hawaiian, an affirmation, which as you will perceive on reflection, is open to the gravest question. There are then really two separate and distinct ends and objects, one to save the Hawaiian race, another, to import a foreign one. I am well aware, Gentlemen, that although these two questions are by no means very clearly separated in many parts of your Address, and the solemn invocation of a former sovereign for one of these objects is made use of as applying to both, you did not intend to suggest to His Majesty to change His Ministers because they had failed in staying the decline of the Hawaiian race, or in steadily proceeding for nearly, perhaps fully, a century, nor because they had neglected anything that the laws of this country and the appropriation of money for sanitary purposes, rendered possible, nor indeed that they had neglected anything which you, as a body, or the majority of you had recommended, or were prepared to recommend them to attempt to effect. No, Gentlemen, the failure of the Ministry which you put forward in sufficiently clear terms, is, that they have not induced as many Asiatics and others to migrate to this country, as you consider they might have induced. What you claim as the inaction of His Majesty's Ministers in not importing people is the one great ground of your complaint, the head and front of their offending.

Yet also state, Gentlemen, or at least you leave it to be inferred, as I have already said, that there can be no doubt that we may recuperate the Hawaiian race by introducing another having affinity to it, and which race possessing that affinity exists in Asia, and further that although there may be difficulties in obtaining such a people those difficulties can be overcome by proper management. Here are three separate and distinct affirmations.

With respect to the two last I have little to add to what His Majesty's Government has already stated, but it is only just and proper that it should be clearly placed before you, Gentlemen, and before His Majesty, and before the people of this country, with regard to the first affirmation, what most of you will on a little reflection admit, that the introduction of men and women of any considerable number into this country of any considerable number of any race whatever, having more vitality than the Hawaiians or than the Polynesians, (and all this is assumed in the premises, or it would be useless to bring them at all) would do to say the least, be just as likely to help to exterminate this Hawaiian race, to annihilate this "interesting people," their language and their associations, as it would be to "recuperate" them by amalgamating with them. And yet Gentlemen, have you not been led, it may be unwittingly, in one passage of your Address to convey the idea to His Majesty, that any one who doubted the proposition that the Hawaiian race could be so recuperated would be "false to the best interests of this country, false to the cause of Hawaiian independence, and disloyal to His Majesty's Royal State and Person?"

Again Gentlemen it cannot have escaped the notice of many of you that in an Address of which the main object contemplated is the expenditure of public money in importing large numbers of men and women of a foreign race and language, and in which question the Hawaiian race must be so especially interested, both as to matters of fact and of sentiment—and they are entitled to be consulted in both—it would have been eminently proper that they should have been largely represented, and it must now strike every one as remarkable that there appears the name of one man only appended to your Address who can claim any—the least drop, of Hawaiian blood.

Upon the principle with which I set out, that a document of this sort must be held to mean just what can be gathered from the face of it, your Address is the Address of a few Hawaiian subjects of foreign extraction and of a few foreigners of Honolulu associated in a firm and compact body, asking, may I not say

demanding His Majesty, and that in very objectionable terms, to dismiss his Ministers, who have not brought people enough into this country, and in the name of all that is great, good and patriotic to those in that position who will—for Gentlemen I will not insult your understandings by pretending to imagine that you intended to unite thus enthusiastically on this occasion, to request His Majesty to inaugurate such a "radical" but undefined,—"change in the policy of this country," that—"without further temporizing or delay" you may be secured, almost all the national blessings which can be derived from the best possible Government, at the very least possible expense; although I am prepared to admit that such a request may really appear interspersed throughout your Address.

There can be no doubt, Gentlemen, that the importation of people may be a proper object, and one that is of much interest to most of us—especially at this time when there is every probability that a treaty which will add largely to the value of our main products is almost daily expected to be concluded, and people will be in the greatest demand in all the main branches of industry. It so happens also that in trying to effect our object we may all have the great satisfaction in feeling that our own interest and our patriotism may fairly be combined. Perhaps however, Gentlemen, if you had the framing of your Address to do over again, in asking for that which would be so palpably and so directly of value to many of you, you would be more careful to see, that your patriotism and your loyalty, which no one doubts, should not be asserted too prominently, and above all you would be careful to see, that the danger which you apprehend to the State, in case your wishes are not complied with, should not be exaggerated, in order to place your patriotism and loyalty in a stronger light.

You would certainly in again addressing your Sovereign, avoid everything that had even the appearance of a threat or that would permit a suspicion to arise of an attempt at intimidation, or unnecessary alarm, either towards King, Ministers or people; and you would not I am sure, think it necessary to remind His Majesty of such an event as the riot on the election two years ago; by the otherwise meaningless statement that the "official expenditure" of this country is not "at all times sufficient for the preservation of its own peace" for you would see at a glance that the official expenditure of no country on earth ever sufficed for that. No Gentlemen, no country will ever be rich enough, no country will ever be powerful enough, to at all times "maintain the preservation of its own peace" until God in his mercy moderates the ambition and subdues the evil passions of men. But above all, you would not, whatever explanation you might couple with it, first inform His Majesty that you "rope" for his Accession to the Hawaiian Throne," and then tell him that "this must be done."

What must be done? Must, as your Address reads, "every device and measure of His Majesty's Government be directed towards the acquisition of people?" Must Asiatic men and women be imported into this country whether the King and those of his race are most interested, like it or not?

No, Gentlemen.—The Legislature of this country called King Kalakaua to the Throne, and the Legislature of this country alone, with the King's consent, can permit the revenue of this kingdom to be used for that purpose. Had it been your duty, as it has been mine, to consider this question in its different bearings, you would have perceived ere this, how delicate a matter it is to go to the Hawaiian Legislature and ask them for liberal grants of money with the object of introducing a foreign people, to reduce the value of their own people's labor, which they may urge may be the direct effect of it. But you may answer, it is for the good of the country and for the people's own good, may you will appeal as you have already appealed to every motive, even to securing the independence of the country, and the safety of the Throne. But Gentlemen, the most intelligent Legislatures on earth, are not always guided in the measures they pass, by even such great motives, men will band together in a firm and united phalanx to serve their own interests, or what they may consider their own interests, and it only requires a little "descent" of string together a succession of mellifluous phrases to show that all the patriotism and all the loyalty is on their side, and even to brand their opponents as traitors. In this case it would be very easy for the native Hawaiian to do so. This Address, and the unfortunate tone of it, may offer an incentive to them to band together and forgetting the now nearly obliterated differences among them, unite in the Legislature to resent what they may easily construe, although it was not so intended, into an insult towards their Sovereign, and to rebel what they may consider an aggression towards themselves.—"L'homme propose—et Dieu dispose."

But, Gentlemen, even though the Legislature should refuse to appropriate money for the introduction of people, and they would have every right to do so if it pleased them, is this country then ruined—of its independence gone? By no means. If the treaty we are expecting and which will benefit most of us so materially goes into effect, population must come. It will come as it has come to every country on the face of the earth, in the natural course of events, and if these events are unfavorable it will be all but impossible to oppose them. But the agriculturists and others will require people, and they will get them from whatever part of the world may seem good to them, untrammelled by official incapacity, and they will be well able to afford to bring them at their own expense. The Reciprocity treaty with the United States should it be concluded will be by far the most effective measure for the repopulation of this country from abroad which any Legislature or any Ministry ever completed. Should we obtain this treaty it may be well that a regulation should be enforced, making it compulsory that if large bodies of men are brought to the country at private expense, a certain proportion of women also, should be brought, the expense of which, the State might bear. We are not, Gentlemen, a nest of unfledged birds waiting with our beaks open to be fed, and if we require people to assist us in our various enterprises, we must put our own shoulders to the wheel to get them, and not rely entirely upon His Majesty's Government. Self interest may after all if we may not rely on the government, prove to be as good a method as any that can be desired for the repopulation of this country from abroad.

As has been well observed on this subject, there are three main modes, and three only, by which countries are usually repopulated from abroad; namely, by conquest, from religious enthusiasm, and by self interest. The last must be our main resource. The steady increase of the products of Hawaii, is an earnest that our general population may increase, even without the expected treaty, for the portion of the population that those more especially represent, Gentlemen, those of foreign and mixed extraction, has been steadily increasing, and forms a nucleus for a nation, with an indefinite power of further increase, independent of our hopes of increase of the pure Hawaiian race, or of the immigration, which, under even ordinary circumstances will occur. Upon the due consideration of these facts, their bearing upon

many parts of your Address will readily occur to you.

It may be well, Gentlemen, in forming an opinion as to what your Address conveys on the face of it, to notice what view the public Press of this city takes on this point. A portion of it at once, and without hesitation, accepts the interpretation of your Address, namely as the desire for a change of Ministry, which I have already stated must be placed upon it, and it hastens to inform the public of the array of influential names appended to the document, and which comprises, it says, a sufficiently close adherence to the truth, "five out of eight of the foreign born nobles of the Kingdom, the leading members of the bar, all of our leading merchants, the whole of the editorial fraternity, along with numbers of the most respected and influential citizens of every creed, time, and place to be found in this community." Truly a formidable and a goodly array, and that there may be no mistake as to what it means, the same article goes on to say, "that in our opinion those who are called upon and who are capable of furnishing to the government, plans or more definite and practical suggestions for the repopulation of the country, should have the opportunity to carry them out, which the present incumbency has enjoyed, and at the same time has so signally neglected." And again in another article suggesting the system of a Ministerial Premier it endeavors to give effect to the recommendation for a change of Ministry by undervaluing the efforts and the character of every Minister of this country, past and present, that it can call to mind, reserving only the "loyal and indefatigable Wylie." And it winds up with a patriotic determination to forget in the emergency, past enmities and the bickerings of years, in the following appeal. "And if our contemporary will join with us in sustaining a healthy public sentiment for reform of government, we may yet hope for the formation of a responsible Ministry and the establishment of an order of administration of public affairs, that shall stand or fall only when it receives or is denied popular support." Who are they that thus invoke popular support? You must have perceived, Gentlemen, that those who managed for this Address, have in this whole matter ignored the pure native element, they have neglected to give due consideration to that part of the Hawaiian population which has really the most interest in the matter, and the most right to be heard on this important question. This oversight, however is to be explained, if those gentlemen were more strongly impressed with the advantages which this country would derive from a change of Ministry, than the particular steps which would be ultimately necessary for the introduction of people. They have been literally "reckoning without their host," and it is a remarkable coincidence, Gentlemen, that any portion of the Press should at the same moment make the same mistake, and one of such magnitude. If to have another set of men at the head of affairs, was the object of the framers of your Address, as no doubt it was, it was a grand mistake, a mistake which ought to be, and which is, fatal, absolutely fatal, to any such result as a change of Ministry at the present moment, that there should not have been appended to it the name of one single man of pure Hawaiian blood.

Out of this I wish to say that your letter seems founded on two errors, one, that the Address was a call to His Majesty to dismiss His Ministry as not possessing the public confidence, and the other that the signers were led into signing the Address by some person without knowing its contents. Had the former proposition been intended, I assure you I should have asked that it be stated in so many words. At a meeting called at the house of Mr. Gibson, that gentleman laid before a number of gentlemen a sketch of a plan for an Immigration Society to be chartered by the Government, and in which the Government were to be asked to take a number of shares, or to aid in some other way.

At a subsequent meeting this plan was criticised by several, myself among the number. It was pointed out that all that private enterprise could be counted upon to do, would be, to provide so far as possible under the laws, for the administration of private industries; that any comprehensive scheme or plan for general immigration upon a scale commensurate with the national wants would require some diplomatic action: that if immigrants could be found, some public works would need to be undertaken to furnish employment for such when they first arrived and that the expenses of such a movement should be borne by Government. I remember myself suggesting that if the Ministry would press investigations with such objects in view, they could levy taxes to meet the expenses in such a way as to make those who were prospering in the country contribute to such reaping and that they would be vigorously sustained by the people who really desired the continued independence of the kingdom. It was further stated that no persons were better aware of the needs of the kingdom than yourself and the Minister of Finance, who was present at the meeting, but that for some reasons unknown to the public no recent effort in the direction indicated had been made.

From this grew the suggestion that a memorial to His Majesty giving earnest expression to the views of those present would bring the subject before the Government with what little influence our names would carry to sustain the Government in any effort they might make with the Legislature about to meet, to provide for the immigration of people, and that His Majesty's Government were only too anxious to make to meet a national want.

The only objection I had to make to the memorial was that some demagogue would take the occasion to try and work upon the prejudices of ignorant Hawaiians by leading them to regard it as a movement to supplant them in their own land and cheapen their labor; and in consequence to paralyze the ministry in their efforts. But I am free to confess that I did not expect such a course from any member of the Government. The subject of Retrenchment was earnestly discussed, and in the same spirit. The present was deemed a critical time because the Legislature was about to meet, and would not be convened again for two years. It was also hoped that these subjects would receive due mention in the address from the Throne to the Legislative Assembly.

A committee was appointed to draft the memorial, and quite a number of the signers subsequently met to discuss the draft prepared, a number of amendments and alterations were made, all with the view of preserving a respectful tone while giving very earnest expression to what was felt to be of great importance to the throne and people of this nation. The very word "must," to which you seem to take exception, was discussed, and, for my own part, feeling that it was solemnly true, if the independence of the nation was to be preserved, I adhered to it as one of those words which among the "mellifluous phrases" would arrest attention and win for the memorial just that attention which we desired for it, and I believe the event proves the correctness of the thought.

I expected the reply from His Majesty, on whose courtesy we knew we could depend, for a fair consideration of our memorial and a generous judgment of our motives would be carefully considered by His Ministers, and while they might point out difficulties of which we could have no knowledge, that they would acknowledge the importance of the subjects presented, and avail themselves of any aid they could get in carrying out plans which they, with their sources of information might devise. The Ministerial reply I should not have allowed to but for your belligerent letter of the 11th inst. An old story I think illustrates the tone of the ministerial reply. A physician, coming from the house of a patient just confined, was met by a friend, who anxiously inquired after

this country which can oblige them to do it, and there is no power out of it, that would. It is evident that a great want of "help" which we all see one is perhaps close at hand, as well as a general and a very proper desire for the best possible government has probably induced many of you, Gentlemen, to place your names to an objectionable document of which you did not notice the full drift and import, whilst, "the Press" or rather the two Honolulu newspapers which depend for their existence, upon your support has mistaken you for the people" for to them you are the people to all intents and purposes.

Such being the position of affairs, and for the literal truth of which I appeal as well to each and all of you, Gentlemen, as to the People of the land from Hawaii to Nihaa, it seems to me my clear duty not to offer my resignation to His Majesty, at the present moment, and further it will be my duty to caution him, whenever the King or the people of this country desire a change of ministry, to beware of charlatans, and especially of such as may possess abilities fully sufficient to lead those who trust in them into difficulties, but which may not suffice to lead them out.

In conclusion, and with reference to the style of the Address, Gentlemen, which you have presented to His Majesty, you now no doubt regret with me, that it has unfortunately gone before His Majesty, before the country, and before the world, with a ringing tone of bold assertion, exaggeration and insolence, which, however, you will be glad to learn, His Majesty and His Majesty's Ministers believe, you never intended. W. L. GREEN.

Honolulu, March 11, 1876.

Reply to His Ex. W. L. Green.

To HIS EXCELLENCY W. L. GREEN, Minister of Foreign Affairs.

SIR.—On the 11th instant I received from you a printed communication addressed to certain persons by name "and to the other gentlemen who signed the Address to His Majesty dated February 22nd, 1876."

As one of the signers of that Address, having held official relations to yourself and the Department of which you preside, in the course of which I had the pleasure of receiving from you expressions of approbation and esteem, and experiencing constantly such confidence and generous assistance in my official duties as to enhance the confidence for your usefulness to the country, which I entertained on your elevation to the high position you occupy, I beg to be allowed the privilege of responding publicly and with the same candor which marks your letter to the signers of the Address.

At the outset, I wish to say that your letter seems founded on two errors, one, that the Address was a call to His Majesty to dismiss His Ministry as not possessing the public confidence, and the other that the signers were led into signing the Address by some person without knowing its contents. Had the former proposition been intended, I assure you I should have asked that it be stated in so many words. At a meeting called at the house of Mr. Gibson, that gentleman laid before a number of gentlemen a sketch of a plan for an Immigration Society to be chartered by the Government, and in which the Government were to be asked to take a number of shares, or to aid in some other way.

At a subsequent meeting this plan was criticised by several, myself among the number. It was pointed out that all that private enterprise could be counted upon to do, would be, to provide so far as possible under the laws, for the administration of private industries; that any comprehensive scheme or plan for general immigration upon a scale commensurate with the national wants would require some diplomatic action: that if immigrants could be found, some public works would need to be undertaken to furnish employment for such when they first arrived and that the expenses of such a movement should be borne by Government. I remember myself suggesting that if the Ministry would press investigations with such objects in view, they could levy taxes to meet the expenses in such a way as to make those who were prospering in the country contribute to such reaping and that they would be vigorously sustained by the people who really desired the continued independence of the kingdom. It was further stated that no persons were better aware of the needs of the kingdom than yourself and the Minister of Finance, who was present at the meeting, but that for some reasons unknown to the public no recent effort in the direction indicated had been made.

From this grew the suggestion that a memorial to His Majesty giving earnest expression to the views of those present would bring the subject before the Government with what little influence our names would carry to sustain the Government in any effort they might make with the Legislature about to meet, to provide for the immigration of people, and that His Majesty's Government were only too anxious to make to meet a national want.

The only objection I had to make to the memorial was that some demagogue would take the occasion to try and work upon the prejudices of ignorant Hawaiians by leading them to regard it as a movement to supplant them in their own land and cheapen their labor; and in consequence to paralyze the ministry in their efforts. But I am free to confess that I did not expect such a course from any member of the Government. The subject of Retrenchment was earnestly discussed, and in the same spirit. The present was deemed a critical time because the Legislature was about to meet, and would not be convened again for two years. It was also hoped that these subjects would receive due mention in the address from the Throne to the Legislative Assembly.

A committee was appointed to draft the memorial, and quite a number of the signers subsequently met to discuss the draft prepared, a number of amendments and alterations were made, all with the view of preserving a respectful tone while giving very earnest expression to what was felt to be of great importance to the throne and people of this nation. The very word "must," to which you seem to take exception, was discussed, and, for my own part, feeling that it was solemnly true, if the independence of the nation was to be preserved, I adhered to it as one of those words which among the "mellifluous phrases" would arrest attention and win for the memorial just that attention which we desired for it, and I believe the event proves the correctness of the thought.

I expected the reply from His Majesty, on whose courtesy we knew we could depend, for a fair consideration of our memorial and a generous judgment of our motives would be carefully considered by His Ministers, and while they might point out difficulties of which we could have no knowledge, that they would acknowledge the importance of the subjects presented, and avail themselves of any aid they could get in carrying out plans which they, with their sources of information might devise. The Ministerial reply I should not have allowed to but for your belligerent letter of the 11th inst. An old story I think illustrates the tone of the ministerial reply. A physician, coming from the house of a patient just confined, was met by a friend, who anxiously inquired after

the health of the family. The doctor pompously replied:—"The child is dead. The mother will surely die, but with the aid of Divine help I hope to save the old man." Paradoxical me if I say I was reminded of this by the pious ejaculations of the ministry, who, acknowledging their inability to do anything to save the nation, hope by Divine aid and the exclusion of Hindoo diseases to save themselves.

The absence of any allusion to the question of retrenchment disappointed many of the signers, but we now hope you will act upon it if any of "pure Hawaiian blood" shall advocate it.

The political resort to an attempt to work upon the pride or sense of neglect of the Hawaiians and mechanics, will of course fail, if they have the intelligence you credit them with, for the memorialists never pretended to represent the people or the popular will, simply desiring to give expression to their own opinions; but the resort is probably justified by the rule you yourself lay down that it is not necessary to be "either precise or correct in your reasonings."

I am how-ever confident that in taking refuge behind the ignorant prejudices to which you appeal, you are following rather the dictates of a hasty temper than those of your better judgment. You are well aware that everything which has ever been accomplished for the good of this people has been done in spite of ignorant and unreasoning sentiments by the aid of the higher wisdom of the better classes of Hawaiians, and whenever any one has wished to advocate temperance, disloyalty and opposition to beneficial measures, he has appealed to these same "sentiments," but I had hoped since such appeals had borne their legitimate fruits in the riots, at the Barracks and the Court House, they would not be hastily invoked again.

I have now given you the facts as far as I was connected with the memorial, whose tone and purpose you will surely misapprehend.

I thought that the increased population of the country and retrenchment, or a wiser appropriation of public funds were subjects in which you sympathized with the memorialists, and the memorial could in no wise reflect upon the ministry except so far as they were responsible for inaction or failure, and to that extent I still desire the reflection so far as I am concerned to rest. If the statements which I have reflected upon any one, it is not the fault of the statement.

I am free to confess that I do not regret with you the publication of the Address, though if it is unfortunate, you will remember it was the ministry who made it public, not the memorialists, and if any of the latter obtain undue prominence they will owe it to the same ministry.

So far as its tone was concerned, I think it was intended to be bold in its assertions. I do not believe it possible to exaggerate the importance of the subjects presented. I resent the imputation of "insolence," (which is usually an attribute of office.) If His Majesty believed no insolence was intended, you as His Majesty's servant should never have charged the memorial with it. For myself I have no charity to ask from His Majesty's Ministers in regard to my intentions. Having signed the memorial I desire to take any responsibility that may attach to it.

With reference to your defiant assertion that unless the King and his Ministers choose to do things in their own way no power exists to oblige them to do it;—I presume the Legislative Assembly might be found to possess the power, but aside from that, I beg to remind you of powers silent and inexorable, to which even Cabinet Ministers are amenable—the operation of causes which produce inevitable effects. And if the administration to spite "a few designing men" as you please to style us, dare neglect the duties of the hour, the effects will come in spite of Cabinet resolutions to postpone action.

However sir, we have differed before, and my respect for you suffered no diminution thereby. On these questions I still believe that our differences grow out of erroneous interpretation you gave the memorial in construing it as a personal attack upon yourself. I beg to say in conclusion, that while I regret that you thought it necessary to use offensive terms, I respect the vigor and candor with which you sustain your views over your own name, as I hold that no man who has not the "courage of his opinions" is fit for office, and if the memorial does no more than excite discussion, and to develop the fact that we have a Minister in the Cabinet who is prepared to act out of leading strings and have opinions of his own and sustain them, letting the public know the grounds on which he stands, it will have served no mean purpose. I earnestly hope it will be some time before the "fair proportion" of native Hawaiians and Mechanics at whose behest you express your willingness to bow, will demand your portfolio for I am confident that after careful consideration you will be prepared to join us in saying something must be done, and that something can be done; and unless I mistake the "ringing tone," etc. etc. of your letter, something will be done, in which I hope to be allowed some humble way with other citizens and subjects to assist you.

HENRY A. P. CARTER.

Nuuanu, March 13, 1876.

MR. EDITOR.—In a letter to Mr. W. L. Green on the 13th inst. I am told that I wounded the susceptibilities of some of my fellow citizens who I addressed. The ignorant prejudices to which I allude are the same referred to in a former paragraph as subject to demagogic appeal, and subsequent to the "sentiments" which have been applied to before, and did not in any way refer to Mechanics, as the context shows, for they certainly had no connection with the riot mentioned. Perhaps a better arrangement of my paragraphs would have avoided any misapprehension of my meaning.

HENRY A. P. CARTER.

Queen St. Mar. 14 1876.

The following characteristic incident is related of Andrew Johnson: In 1855, when he was opposing for governor of Tennessee, the opposing party was very bitter in its campaign against him, and threats of personal violence were frequently made. On this occasion, while he was "stumping" the State, he appeared at a meeting with a revolver in his hand. Laying it upon the table, he said:—"Fellow-citizens—I have been informed that part of the business to be transacted on the present occasion is the assassination of the individual who has now the honor of addressing you. I respectfully propose that this be the first business in order. Therefore, if any man has come here to-night for the purpose indicated, I do not say to him, let him speak, but let him shoot." He paused a moment, with his hand on his pistol, and then said:—"Gentlemen—it appears that I have been misinformed. I will now proceed to address you on the subject which has brought us together."

CASE OF THE SCHOONER "ANNA" PLUNDERED IN CHINESE WATERS.—BERLIN, Feb. 12th.—The Reichsanzeiger states that the Governments of the United States, England and Russia have promised to support any steps the German Envoy to China may be authorized to take in connection with the case of the German schooner Anna, which was plundered off Foo Chow last September. It is hoped from this action that satisfaction may be obtained, and that the Chinese Government in its own interest will be convinced of the necessity of taking measures to prevent similar occurrences in future.